

up all night last Oct 3,  
writing diff. letter to Blight;  
call Kline, then Sherwin, Sunday  
4 Oct; SH confirm No; London  
calls from Havana;

1 Oct 87 Jhon

[ notes on assumption that

To Blight:

SH will release — <sup>or Oct 2 Oct 3</sup>  
there were ~~discussed~~ on Fri, Oct 2; (or O - March 12-13)  
reassured early, 5 Oct: he will  
give WP. Blight proposes 1 + 2

big Nerd:

letter was

informing:

not the way

to grow - people

talk to each;

Talked to me

like a child

(a, an unusual

student or

applicant/sufficient

(judge to convicted

below)

S & N are right — a public review is not the  
way for me to release this info

- for me, or for Howard

- primarily because I <sup>can't</sup> ~~can't~~ reveal my evidence

(like PP!) without endangering myself and Howard  
(= RAND)

- yet evidence is needed, for proper impact.

But the same applies to Blight Proposal 3:

paper, printed review, publication;

which would also be too slow to enlarge the

debate this fall. ("Lesson learned" is left-Ross

will stick for quite a while, give brief, intense

public attention.

Still S & N — thanks — but all proposals come from one of myself — "like  
S — and I agree, cooperation with the rejection" Woodward

Only solution to my narrow aim:

- formalistic investigation (X) (academic, "official"  
approach can't get at these data, probably,  
and couldn't afford, institutionally, to publish it!)

(X)

- Or real prime of me, etc.

~~Full from to circles of WGBH think~~  
(and) to apologize

I will gladly share my conclusions + interp  
with anyone now, so they can relate to it as a  
hypo — (Can understand why Blight found it plausible  
enough without precise evidence).

- Please read —

, Happy to participate in, or lead, review discussion.

- Letter (or any time) review — NO resolutions, no press —  
on "Cuba II. Model IV" or VN '65, '69-73. Am Rev. Mod. IV